UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,629	01/11/2002	Richard M. Hartman	PD-201126 (ONET 0102 PUS)	8622

7590 03/01/2005

Robert P. Renke
Artz & Artz, P.C.
Suite 250
28333 Telegraph Road
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER	
BHATIA, AJAY M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/044,629	HARTMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ajay M Bhatia	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/11/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: A heterogeneous multi-client network presentation system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. If this is an oversight by the examiner the applicant is welcome to point out distinctly where in the specification support can be found for the limitation in the claims.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 4 contains the trademark/trade name Serge. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or

product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a internet data adapter and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "high-speed" in claim 6 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "high-speed" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. High-speed for the purposes of this office action it will be treated as any connection.

The term "very small aperture" in claim 11 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term " very small aperture " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the

invention. For the purposes of this office action it will be treated as any type of screen not used with a desktop computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boys (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0059373) in view of Atkinson (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0039571).

6. For claim 1, Boys teaches, a telecommunication control system for an interactive instruction network system comprising:

an presenter software interface displaying communication signals in a host compatible software language;

a presentation server modifying said communication signals by performing a plurality of presenter chosen tasks via said presenter software interface;

two or more bi-directional client adapters converting communication signals between said host compatible software language and two or more heterogeneous client type compatible software languages; and

one or more Internet data adapter(s) directing said communication signals between said presenter software interface and said via one or more Internet protocols. (See Boys, paragraphs 19-21, 24, 26 and 31-32, a internet data adapter is inherent in creating a connecting to the internet)

Boy fails to teach, two or more heterogeneous client types,
Atkinson teaches, two or more heterogeneous client types (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide internet access and communication over multiple types of devices in order to by providing communication over multiple type of device it provides a increase access to the internet and other type of media in public spaces. (See Atkinson, paragraphs 5-6) and (See Boys, paragraph 19)

7. For claim 2, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 1 wherein said communication signals comprise at least one of a presentation signal, an instruction signal, a client type signal, or a response signal. (See Boys, paragraphs 31-32)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2.

8. For claim 3, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 1 further comprising an Internet data adapter manager controlling transmission of said communication signals between said one or more Internet data adapters and said two or more bi-directional client adapters. (See Boys, paragraph 32)
The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2.

9. For claim 4, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 1 wherein at least one of said Internet data adapters is a SERGE adapter. (See Boys, paragraphs 19-21, 24, and 31-32, since serge is indefinite see 112 rejection above it is treated as any internet adapter, a internet data adapter is inherent in creating a connecting to the internet)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 4.

10. For claim 5, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 1 wherein said one or more Internet protocols comprise at least one of a multicast transport, a unicast transport, a transmission control protocol, a low bandwidth protocol, point-to-point protocol, or a user datagram protocol. (See Boys, paragraphs 24, 27, 31-32, and figure 4, it is obvious that multicast and/or unicast are using in figure 4, and transmission control protocol and user datagram protocol are used in the accessing of the internet)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 5.

11. For claim 6, Boys-Atkinson teaches, an interactive instruction network system comprising:

two or more of heterogeneous client types at two or more remote sites;

a host site comprising;

an presenter hardware interface for communicating with said two or more heterogeneous client types; and

a controller comprising a telecommunication control system and electrically coupled to said presenter hardware interface and transmitting a plurality of presenter communication signals; and

a high-speed data communication transport electrically coupled to said two or more heterogeneous client types and said host site, said high-speed data communication transport providing said two or more heterogeneous client types access to said plurality of presenter communication signals and communication between said host site and said two or more heterogeneous client types. (See Boys, paragraphs 19-24, 26 and 31-32, a internet data adapter is inherent in creating a connecting to the internet, IDSN is considered a high speed data communication transport) and (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 6.

12. For claim 7, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein said communication transport is an Internet. (See Boys, paragraphs 20 and 21)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 7.

13. For claim 8, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 7 wherein said Internet is accessed through at least one of an Internet service provider, a network service provider, a corporate modem bank, a digital subscriber line, a satellite system, or a cable television network. (See Boys, paragraphs 20 and 21)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 8.

14. For claim 9, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein said telecommunication control system comprises:
an presenter software interface displaying communication signals in a host compatible software language;

a presentation server modifying said communication signals by performing a plurality of presenter chosen tasks via said presenter software interface;
two or more bi-directional client adapters converting communication signals between said host compatible software language and two or more heterogeneous client type compatible languages; and
one or more Internet data adapter(s) directing said communication signals between said presenter software interface and said two or more heterogeneous client types via one or more Internet protocols. (See Boys, paragraphs 26-27) and (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 9.

15. For claim 10, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein a heterogeneous client type of said two or more client types is incorporated within an Intranet. (See Boys, paragraph 20, private WAN is type of intranet network)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 10.

16. For claim 11, Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein a heterogeneous client type of said two or more client types comprises a very small aperture terminal

interface. (See Atkinson, paragraph 43, it is well known in the art the pda and cell phones have small screen)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 11.

17. For claim 12, Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein a heterogeneous client type of said two or more client types is incorporated within a Bluetooth network. (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 12.

18. For claim 13, Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein said two or more heterogeneous client types comprises two or more of a cellular phone, a computer, a personal digital assistant, a palm pilot, a scanner, a printer, a video camera, a telephone, or a facsimile machine. (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 13.

19. For claim 14, Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein a heterogeneous client type of said two or more client types comprises at least one of a microphone, a keyboard, a mouse, a video monitor, a LCD screen, a 7-segment display, or a computer. (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 14.

20. For claim 15, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein:
a heterogeneous client type of said two or more client types comprises a video camera generating a remote site communication signal; and

wherein said host site receives said remote site communication signal via said telecommunication system. (See Boys, paragraph 58, it is obvious to use a video camera to record video)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

21. For claim 16, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a system as in claim 6 wherein a first client type is able to receive communication through said communication transport between said host site and a second client type. (See Boys, paragraphs 24-28) and (See Atkinson paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 16.

22. For claim 17, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a method of remote educational instruction over an interactive instruction network system comprising:
broadcasting a plurality of presenter communication signals of a presenter from a host site;
establishing a communication connection between said host site and two or more heterogeneous client type via a communication transport;
receiving said presenter communication signals on said two or more heterogeneous client types; and
displaying or articulating at least one of said presenter communication signals on said two or more heterogeneous client types. (See Boys, paragraphs 19-21, 24, 26 and 31-32, a internet data adapter is inherent in creating a connecting to the internet) and (See Atkinson paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 17.

23. For claim 18, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a method as in claim 17 further comprising:
generating and transmitting a plurality of remote site communication signals; and

receiving said plurality of remote site communication signals on a presenter interface at said host site. (See Boys, paragraphs 31-33)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 18.

24. For claim 19, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a method as in claim 17 further comprising receiving communication between said host site and a first client type at a first remote site by a second client type at a second remote site. The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2.

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 19.

25. For claim 20, Boys-Atkinson teaches, a method of synchronizing and converting communication signals between a controller and heterogeneous client types within an interactive instruction network system, said method comprising:

displaying communication signals on a presenter interface;

modifying said communicational signals;

converting said communication signals between a host language and two or more heterogeneous client type languages;

time synchronizing the communication signals; and

displaying the communication signals on multiple learning media at multiple remote locations. (See Boys, paragraphs 14, 19-21, 24, 26 and 31-32) and (See Atkinson, paragraph 43)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 20.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US-6,084,581 by Hunt Gregory, W.
2. US-6,161,137 by Ogdon et al.
3. US-6,195,684 by Watababe et al.
4. US-6,598,075 by Ogdon et al.
5. US-6,629,129 by Bookspan et al.
6. US-6,725,460 by Nishiyama et al.
7. US-6,753,883 by Schena et al.
8. US-6,760,754 by Isaacs et al.
9. US-2002/0023133 by Kato et al.
10. US-2002/0091614 by Yehia et al.
11. US-2002/0133516 by Davis et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia M Wallace can be reached on (571)-272-6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB

MARTIN-WALLACE
RY PATENT EXAMINER
OGY CENTER 2700